

DETAILED ACTION

- A. This action is in response to the following communications: Request for Continued Examination filed 08/14/2008.
- B. Claims 1-8 and 17-26 remains pending.
-

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/14/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-8 and 17-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gershony (US 6,549,218 B1), herein referred to as “Gershony”.

As for independent claim 1, Gershony teaches a computer-executable method, comprising: arranging a parent window to contain a plurality of child windows (col.1, lines 48-54; col.8, line 38); providing via the arranging enhanced functionality available to the parent window through a media integration layer (MIL) component (visual bit used in the win management component to change the style of the window) to one or more legacy windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality by, for each of the plurality of child windows (col.6, lines 61-67 and col.7, lines 1-13): determining if a the child window of a the parent window is a legacy window that does not natively support the enhanced functionality or is an MIL-aware window that natively supports the enhanced functionality when the child window is a legacy window (col.6, lines 14-30); causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer; retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer (col.7, line 2); and applying a visual enhancement to the child window output through the enhanced functionality available to the parent window (col.7, line 3); and when the child window is an MIL-aware window, rendering the child window directly through the MIL component; and composing a visual representation of the parent window having the visually enhanced child window output corresponding to each child window determined to be a legacy window (col.7, lines 4-16). (col.2, lines 63-67; col.3,

lines 1-4; col.6, lines 18-35 and 61-67; col.7, lines 1-67 and col.8, lines 1-33)

As for dependent claim 2, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein the legacy window is configured to be administered by a legacy display component having fewer visual enhancements than a Media Integration Layer (MIL) component (col.6, lines 14-35; col.7, lines 60-67; col.8, lines 1-12)..

As for dependent claim 3, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 2, wherein causing the child window output to be redirected comprises instructing the legacy display component to redirect the child window output to the off-screen buffer (col.7, line 2).

As for dependent claim 4, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 3, wherein the legacy display component comprises a user subcomponent and a Graphics Device Interface subcomponent (col.7, lines 3-12 and 53-59).

As for dependent claim 5, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein the visual enhancement comprises a selected one or more from a group comprising re-sizing, re-shaping, relocating window component output, applying transparency, rotating and translating window component output, and applying a texture or visual effect to the window component output (col.7, lines 33-59).

As for dependent claim 6, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 1, wherein the visual enhancement comprises scaling the child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable (col.7, lines 50-59).

As for dependent claim 7, Gershony teaches the method recited in claim 2 4-, wherein composing the visual representation of the parent window is performed by the MIL component (col.6, lines 14-35; col.7, lines 60-67; col.8, lines 1-12).

As for independent claim 8, Gershony teaches *a computer-readable medium having, stored thereon, computer-executable instructions which, when executed, direct a computer to perform acts comprising:*

arranging a parent window to contain a plurality of child windows;

providing via the arranging enhanced functionality available to the parent window through a media integration layer (MIL) component (visual bit used in the win management component to change the style of the window) to one or more legacy windows of the contained plurality of child

windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality by, for each of the plurality of child windows (col.6, lines 61-67 and col.7, lines 1-13):

determining if a the child window of a the parent window is a legacy

window that does not natively support the enhanced functionality or is an MIL-aware window that natively supports the enhanced functionality when the child window is a

legacy window (col.6, lines 14-30);causing the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer; retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer (col.7, line 2); and applying a visual enhancement to the child window output through the enhanced functionality available to the parent window (col.7, line 3); and when the child window is an MIL-aware window, rendering the child window directly through the MIL component; and composing a visual representation of the parent window having the visually enhanced child window output corresponding to each child window determined to be a legacy window (col.7, lines 4-16). (col.2, lines 63-67; col.3, lines 1-4; col.6, lines 18-35 and 61-67; col.7, lines 1-67 and col.8, lines 1-33).

As for independent claim 17, Gershony teaches an apparatus comprising:,"
a processor; and memory storing components executable via the processor~ the components including:
a user component configured to invoke a media integration layer (MIL) component to directly render a parent window and one or more child windows of the parent window that are MIL-aware and create an off-screen buffer upon
detecting the presence of a legacy child window of a parent window;
a GDI component configured to redirect window output from the
legacy child window to the off-screen buffer upon being notified by the
user component of the existence of the legacy child window; and
a MIL component configured to retrieve the redirected window
output from the off-screen buffer and apply a visual enhancement to the

redirected window output in connection with composing the parent window for display on a display device and to directly render the one or more child windows of the parent window that are MIL-aware, wherein the parent window is configured to: contain a plurality of child windows; support enhanced functionality available through the MIL component; and enable the enhanced functionality available through the MIL component to visually enhance one or more legacy child windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality of the MIL component (note the analysis of claim 1 above and col.6, lines 14-67; col.7, lines 33-59; col.8, lines 13-15 and 24-26).

As for dependent claim 18, Gershony teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 17, wherein the user component maintains data structures that describe a layout and position of the legacy child window and its legacy children (col.6, lines 14-35 and 61-67; col.7, lines 20-32 and 60-67; col.8, lines 1-34).

As for dependent claim 19, Gershony teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 17, wherein the MIL component maintains data structures that describe a layout and position of the parent window and its children (col.6, lines 14-35 and 61-67; col.7, lines 20-32 and 60-67; col.8, lines 1-34).

As for dependent claim 20, Gershony teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 19, wherein the visual enhancement is at least one of a plurality

of visual enhancements comprising re-sizing, re-shaping, relocating window component output, applying transparency, rotating and translating window component output, applying a texture or visual effect to the window component output, and scaling the legacy child window output to reflect a different screen resolution than originally applicable (col.6, lines 14-35 and 61-67; col.7, lines 20-32 and 60-67; col.8, lines 1-12 and 43-67).

As for dependent claim 21, Gershony teaches the apparatus computer executable medium recited in claim 17, wherein the MIL component is further configured to interact with the user component and the GDI component to identify a location on a child window of the parent window corresponding to a location of an input event (col.6, lines 14-35 and 61-67; col.7, lines 20-32 and 60-67; col.8, lines 1-34).

As for independent claim 22, Gershony teaches *a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions stored thereon that when executed direct a computer to perform acts comprising: determining whether a child window of a parent window is a legacy window that does not natively support enhanced functionality available to the parent window through a media integration layer (MIL) component, or is an MIL-aware window that natively supports the enhanced functionality; responsive to determining that the child window is an MIL-aware window, rendering the child window directly via the MIL component; responsive to determining that the child window is a legacy window that does not natively support enhanced functionality; means for redirecting a child*

window of a parent window to an off-screen buffer responsive to determining that the child window is a legacy window that does not natively support enhanced functionality, wherein the parent window does natively support the enhanced functionality; issuing instructions to notify the parent window that the redirected child window is being or has been set up; retrieving the redirected child window from the off-screen buffer; and applying a visual enhancement to the redirected child window through the enhanced functionality available from the parent window (note the analysis of claim 1 above).

As for dependent claim 23, Gershony teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 22, wherein the instructions to notify the parent comprises a window message indicating that the redirected child window is being created (col.6, lines 14-67).

As for dependent claim 24, Gershony teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 23, wherein the window message includes a window handle to the redirected child window (col.6, lines 14-35 and col.7, lines 17-22).

As for dependent claim 25, Gershony teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 22, wherein the instructions to notify the parent comprises a window message indicating that the redirected child window is about

to be shown (col.6, lines 14-35).

As for dependent claim 26, Gershony teaches the computer-readable medium recited in claim 25, wherein the window message includes a window handle to the redirected child 10 window (col.7, lines 17-32).

(Note:) It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 08/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After careful review of the amended claims (given the broadest interpretation) and the remarks provided by the Applicant along with the cited reference(s) the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant for at least the reasons provided below:

A1. Applicant argues newly added limitations, in such that Gershony does not implement a media integration layer.

R1. Examiner does not agree with Applicant. As described in Applicants disclosure the media integration layer ("MIL") is described as an element of the system which determines to take a regular rectangle window for example (or legacy window; one that is styled undesirable for use in the new system) and then to apply a new style onto the regular window ("legacy window") such that the original style of the legacy window is no longer rendered as its original state instead it now process goes through

this "MIL" component (which is a styling component termed "MIL" by applicant) and as a result the original window is styled differently and rendered differently with special effects applied to the original window, thus changing the appearance. Gershony teaches a similar technique but does not use the term "MIL" instead Gershony explains the use of a presentation manager 215 which contains a win manager 220 and a graphic device interface components 230. Further has a component called special effects 260 which has direct access to bitmaps 250. An application can use the visual bits of the window to be better incorporated into the drawing scheme for example (visual basic, MFC, IE...). Also an application can easily be written that can redirect existing applications to create a new user interface (US) 3D or otherwise as represented by special effects block 260. Thus Gershony provides the same functionally as processed in the current claim language only using different terminology (col.2, lines 63-67; col.3, lines 1-4; col.6, lines 18-35 and 61-67; col.7, lines 1-67 and col.8, lines 1-33).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
October 23, 2008

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179